



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

684888

**MISGOVERNMENT IN THE PHILIPPINES
AND
COST TO THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICAN OCCUPATION**

SPEECH

OF



HON. WILLIAM A. JONES
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 28, 1913



**WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1913**

76329—11728

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. JONES.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 28186) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers of Sunday of last week report that President Taft, in the address which he delivered in New York City on the Saturday evening previous at the Ohio Society dinner, severely attacked the Philippine independence bill reported from the Committee on Insular Affairs and now upon the calendar of this House. What the President said upon this subject is reported in a dispatch to the Washington Herald, which is in these words:

After an emphatic appeal for an enlargement of the Navy, following an address upon similar lines by Representative Hobson, the President launched forth into an attack on the Jones bill, now before Congress, providing for the freedom of the Philippines within eight years.

The President termed such a measure "suicidal and highly defective," and said that the United States should treat the Philippines just as Great Britain treats Canada and Australia—as colonies—but should not free them under any circumstances.

WOULD CREATE TROUBLE.

"Were I a political party," said the President, "I could wish the Democrats no worse fortune than the passage of the Jones bill, which I am positive, from my long acquaintance with the Philippine Islands, would result in a mess and a muss which would forever return to plague its makers. The Philippines have cost the United States to date \$3,000,000 for civil expenses, and this money was appropriated to save them from starvation. The expense of maintaining troops in the islands is practically nil, and I always will be opposed to any measure looking to their freedom."

In a somewhat different account of this address, published in the Washington Post, President Taft is reported to have asked—

Is it possible that little as this Democratic administration knows about the Philippines they are going to let them go and defeat our efforts to raise and educate the Filipino people? Is it possible that it is going to do that with no foundation whatsoever and without the approval of somebody who knows the islands? I hope not.

On the 6th of December last President Taft sent a special message to Congress, in which he expressed in rather vigorous terms and at considerable length his disapprobation of this Philippine independence measure. Among other things he told us in this message that—

To confer independence upon the Filipinos now is therefore to subject the great mass of their people to the dominance of an oligarchical and probably exploiting minority.

A present declaration even of future independence—

He informed Congress—

would retard progress by the dissension and disorder it would arouse.

It has been to me a matter of no little regret, to say nothing of surprise, that President Taft, for whom I entertain personally the highest regard and the very kindest feelings, should have thought fit to severely criticize and attack in a message to Congress a measure there pending.

It is quite true that it is the constitutional duty of the President to "from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient," but this message neither conveyed information nor recommended legislation to the Congress. On the contrary, it severely denounced and vigorously opposed pending legislation. If the President shall disapprove any bill which has passed the two Houses of Congress, he is empowered by the Constitution to return it to the House in which it originated, along with his objections; but I have failed to find anywhere in that instrument warrant for the course pursued by the President in this case.

But I am not so much concerned over the method employed by the President to make public his views in respect to this measure as I am in the views themselves.

With great deference for his superior knowledge and information, I must nevertheless dissent from the unsupported opinion expressed by him that to confer independence upon the Filipinos would subject the masses "to the dominance of an oligarchical and probably exploiting minority," and I believe that his statement that "a present declaration even of future independence" would arouse disorder and retard progress is opposed to the

enlightened opinion and best judgment of a vast majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I not only assert, but I shall undertake to prove by incontrovertible facts, that the government which the United States has imposed upon the Filipinos, and under the dominance of which they are now forced to live, is an oligarchy of the most intolerable, despotic, and unrestricted character.

I shall attempt no reply to President Taft's alleged characterization of the pending Philippine independence bill as "suicidal and defective"; nor shall I endeavor at this time to convince the House that the Filipinos are capable of governing themselves and that it is the duty of the United States to grant them their independence. It will be time enough to discuss the merits and demerits of this measure when it comes up for consideration. I hope to have the opportunity in the near future of presenting at greater length than could now be done the reasons which impel my belief that some such measure as that which seems to have so greatly aroused the opposition of President Taft will prove a wise and just solution of the Philippine problem. In the meantime I shall avail myself of this, the first opportunity that has presented itself, to make reply to a few of the statements in which he is alleged to have indulged at the Ohio Society dinner.

The United States, he is reported to have said, should treat the Philippines just as Great Britain treats Canada and Australia, but should not free them under any circumstances. When, may I ask, did he reach this conclusion? Canada and Australia are in every essential respect, if not absolutely and completely, self-governing colonies. Each has its own elective parliament; each makes its own laws, lays its own taxes, and collects and disburses its own revenues. Great Britain exercises absolutely no control over the domestic affairs of either of these colonies. They not only control their internal affairs, but they negotiate their commercial treaties, and they lay their tariff duties, and in this and other respects are more self-governing and autonomous than any State in our American Union.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Does Great Britain reserve any veto power as to legislation passed by Australia or the Canadian Parliaments?

Mr. JONES. I am coming to that directly. It is true that they do not select their own governors general, but it is also true that not within the memory of living man has the veto power been exercised by a governor general of either colony. The people of Canada and Australia are virtually as free and independent as those of England herself.

We are indebted to Australia for the secret-ballot system in vogue in every State in our Union. I wonder, too, if President Taft knows that pure democracy prevails to such an extent in Australia that the initiative, referendum, and recall have already been adopted there. Surely he, of all men, would not like to see the recall of judges introduced in the Philippines. How is it with the Philippine Islands?

The act of Congress under which they are governed was passed more than a decade ago, and President Taft, more than any other human being, is responsible for its provisions. The governor general, vice governor, members of the Philippine Commission, and the heads of the various executive departments are all appointed by the President of the United States. The legislature since 1907 has consisted of two houses, this appointive commission, which is known as the upper house, and an elective assembly. This body legislates for the civilized, Christianized people, but the commission, under the organic act, is the sole legislative body for the non-Christian and uncivilized tribes, and exercises supreme and exclusive legislative authority over all their territory, their lives, their property, and their public revenues. Let us see what has been the practical operation—some of the actual, tangible results—of this anomalous condition of affairs. In the first place, no measure originating in the assembly can become a law unless it meets the approval of the commission, and, of course, the reverse of this proposition is also true. Realizing that disagreements would inevitably arise between the commission and the assembly, and that the annual appropriation bills for the support of the government might thus fail of passage, the organic act provides that in such event "an amount equal to the sums appropriated in

the last appropriation bills for such purposes shall be deemed to be appropriated, and until the legislature shall act in such behalf the treasurer may, with the advice of the governor, make the payments necessary for the purposes aforesaid." The purpose of this law is, as has been said by another, to provide for the contingency of an honest difference of opinion between these two houses as well as for unreasonable or factious attempts on the part of either house to embarrass the government by withholding the supplies necessary for its existence.

Twice has the legislature failed to pass these supply bills. One of the causes for the disagreements which led to the deadlock between the two branches of the legislature and which resulted in these failures to pass appropriation bills was that the assembly insisted that the salaries of the members of the commission, who were also heads of executive departments, should be so reduced as to make them more nearly correspond to those received by members of the American Cabinet. But the chief cause of disagreement was the insistence of the commission upon the right which it claimed to appropriate large sums of money out of the public revenues of the insular treasury, to be expended upon what is known as the Benguet Road, without the concurrence and despite the earnest opposition of the other coordinate branch of the legislature.

The Benguet Road is a highway less than 20 miles in length, built at a cost of several millions of dollars in gold through a mountain gorge to a health resort or residential park, called Baguio, to which place, at great expense, the seat of government is transferred from Manila for several months each year, and where American officials have handsome homes, clubhouses, polo grounds, and other sources of recreation and amusement. The Filipinos have from the beginning been violently opposed to these vast and absolutely inexcusable expenditures. Not only has it cost millions to build this automobile road through rugged mountains, a highway that is used solely for purposes of recreation and pleasure, but the cost of its upkeep is perhaps not less than \$100,000 a year, and in times of great freshets it has been necessary to rebuild entire sections at an enormous cost. Nothing that our Government has done in the

Philippine Islands has aroused more feeling and created more resentment on the part of the helpless Filipinos of every station in life than this wanton and indefensible disregard of their wishes and interests. [Applause.] This one act of the Philippine Commission has greatly shaken, if not destroyed, the confidence of the Filipino people in the American sense of justice and fair dealing. It has removed every vestige of any sentiment which may have existed in favor of American annexation. Is it then to be wondered at that the assembly, composed as it is entirely of natives, refused to lend itself to such inexcusable and, under the conditions of poverty so common in the islands, criminally wasteful expenditures of the public moneys as I have attempted to describe?

The pretext for the commission's action was that the Benguet Road traversed a part of a non-Christian Province, and that inasmuch as the commission exercised exclusive legislative functions over non-Christian territory it was empowered to expend any amount of the public funds it might desire in the construction and maintenance of that road, and that without either the concurrence or approval of the assembly. The members of the assembly claimed, on the other hand, and with reason, that the commission was only empowered to expend the public money in non-Christian Provinces for the use and benefit of the non-Christian and uncivilized tribes residing therein, and that it was a flagrant violation of law and a perversion of public funds to use them in the construction of an enormously expensive automobile road leading to a mountain resort maintained exclusively for the benefit of themselves and other rich residents of Manila.

It was these disagreements between the commission and the assembly that resulted in the nonpassage of the annual supply bills of which I have spoken, and I believe that every liberty-loving and right-thinking American citizen, when he comes to understand their motives, will applaud Speaker Osmena and his legislative associates for the courage and patriotism which they thus twice displayed. [Applause.]

Whether or not the commission deliberately planned to bring about this unfortunate condition of affairs in order to deprive

the Filipinos of any control over their revenues the result has been the same. Acting under the authority of the provision of law which I have just quoted the Governor General has ordered the appropriation of a sum equal to the total appropriations made in the previous year for the support of the Government. Having thus gotten into his hands more than \$12,000,000 in 1911 and somewhat less than \$14,000,000 in 1912 of the public revenues of the Filipino people the Governor General proceeded to expend these large sums according to his own will, and as in his sole judgment seemed desirable, and with an utter disregard for the purposes for which the prior legislative appropriations had been made. Is there, I ask, a Representative upon this floor who, after reading the law under which Gov. Forbes is supposed to have acted, will not denounce his actions as both arbitrary and illegal? Many an official has been impeached for less than this. Baguio and the Benguet Road were, of course, liberally provided for, new offices were created, and the salaries of existing offices increased. It is needless to say that the salaries of the heads of executive departments were not decreased. It is asserted by a former member of the commission that there were as many as 123 new offices thus created, among them a secretary to the Governor General at an annual salary of \$4,500, and it is a most amazing and stupendous fact that the expenditures on account of bureaus and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, were \$9,638,369.80, as against \$8,318,051.56 for the next preceding year, the excess being a mere bagatelle of \$1,320,318.24 in gold. A people whose self-restraint is equal to orderly and peaceful submission to acts of tyranny and oppression such as these are surely capable of governing themselves.

It is but just to say that there were members of the commission who questioned the legality of these executive acts, and that at least one American member formally and vigorously protested against them. These protests, however, were wholly unavailing. In pursuing this arbitrary and, as I charge, absolutely illegal course the Governor General acted, at least, so far as is publicly known, without legal advice, although not himself a lawyer. He consulted neither the solicitor general nor the attorney general of the islands, and, as I am informed, these

legal advisers of the Government did not agree with the Governor General in his construction of the law or approve his action. Certain it is that the ablest lawyer on the commission, the Hon. Charles B. Elliott, formerly a member of the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, who was recently requested to resign as a result of his emphatic disapproval of the course of Gov. Gen. Forbes, regarded the latter's action as a most flagrant disregard of both the spirit and the letter of the law, for his opinion to this effect is upon record in Manila, and was rendered long before he had any thought of resigning as a member of the commission. Whether or not the Filipinos are capable of self-government, I question the right of Gov. Gen. Forbes to longer govern them.

President Taft tells us that "a declaration even of future independence would retard progress by the dissension and disorder it would arouse." I am curious to know what results he thinks such arbitrary and illegal acts as the one to which I have just called attention are likely to produce. To my mind the fact that the Filipino people have exercised such self-control as to refrain from even the semblance of disorder under conditions so inexpressibly hard and cruelly exasperating as these constitutes the highest tribute to their self-restraint and respect for constituted authority. [Applause.]

Whenever attention is directed to acts such as these on the part of the government which we have set up in the Philippines, the reply has always been glibly made, as if that were sufficient in itself to disarm criticism and forever silence all complaint, that within the past 10 years public schools have greatly multiplied in the Philippines; that the inhabitants of the islands have made wonderful progress in the acquisition of knowledge of various kinds; that sanitary conditions have improved; and that many important public works have been inaugurated as a result of our beneficent rule. The Filipino who does not accept this reply as conclusive of the question is frequently denounced as an ingrate. Indeed, his failure to accept such reasoning as conclusive is cited as evidence of his incapacity for self-government. Nobody denies these things. Nobody denies that there has been great educational and material progress in the

Philippines. I will even admit, for it is a fact, that the parcel post was in the Philippines before Congress could be convinced that it was not too expensive to be thought of for the farmers of the United States. But it must not be forgotten that every dollar of the money contributed for these purposes came out of the pockets of the Filipinos. Nor must it be forgotten that much of it, as I have shown, was needlessly and shamefully wasted, and that the benefits derived from its expenditure, even in those cases where the expenditure was proper, have rarely, if ever, been commensurate with the cost.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY. What evidence has the gentleman as to the accuracy of the statements which he has just made, which have shocked me and I have no doubt shocked many Members of this House?

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I ought to say that I have no disposition to be out of harmony with the gentleman in his statement of the facts. I have been shocked to hear them and I have wondered whether or not the gentleman has any plans for verification or proof of them, which I think ought to go with all such statements.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman that I will submit, and ask to have printed in connection with my remarks, a statement made by a former member of the commission itself.

I have already stated that one member of the commission, Judge Elliott, of Minnesota, has placed upon record in Manila his protest against the construction which Gov. Forbes has placed upon the act of Congress which I have quoted. I will further state to the gentleman that he will find all the information he desires with respect to the Benguet Road if he will read the reports of the investigations of the friar lands sales.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, Mr. Chairman, in such matters as have been referred to they can throw no possible light in regard to the alleged arbitrary and illegal conduct that has taken place with respect to these appropriations.

Mr. JONES. I may say to my friend that there is not a particle of question as to the action of the Governor General

to which I have called attention, and I am sure that every word I have said on that subject will be verified by the Insular Affairs Bureau in this city. These facts are well known and are not questioned in any quarter, so far as I know. It is not denied that Gov. Forbes holds that in disbursing the public funds, if the legislature fails to pass the regular supply bills, he is not confined to the objects named in the last regularly enacted bill.

When the opportunity is afforded me I shall undertake to give this House some idea as to what extent the government we have imposed upon the Filipinos has been extravagant and wasteful. The American people have not the slightest conception of what has been going on in the Philippines. Whilst the head of every bureau—and they are almost innumerable—is provided with a costly automobile, the upkeep of which is also paid for by the Filipinos, there are hundreds of thousands of natives who can not afford shoes for their bare feet.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does that statement go beyond the question of expressing a view as to the right of the Governor General to expend the moneys? Does it go to the question of extravagance in expenditure or misappropriation of funds?

Mr. JONES. It goes to the question of both extravagance and misappropriation.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no knowledge, and I want to find out.

Mr. JONES. It goes to both.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I would say, in the same connection, is it not best for the gentleman to print as a part of his remarks the opinion given by Judge Elliott in relation to the power of the Governor General?

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman that I have in my possession a long and exhaustive legal document bearing upon this subject. I had not intended to put that in the RECORD, but I can put it in if gentlemen so desire. It is in the form of a

letter from one of the commissioners to the auditor of the insular government.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to have the gentleman defer his question until I have concluded what I am now saying; then I shall be glad to reply to any question he may address to me.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to have incorporated here the suggestions that I have in my mind, that the gentleman has made statements which are in the nature of very serious charges, and I think we ought to have the letter to which the gentleman refers as the basis of the presentment.

Mr. JONES. I will publish in connection with my remarks a statement given out by a former member of the commission which fully confirms my statement.

This reckless extravagance and studied disregard for the interests of the poor and defenseless Filipinos has led, as might have been expected, to a deficit, or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say a deficit was only averted during the past fiscal year by the transference of \$1,698,513.82 from the gold-standard fund to the general funds in the Treasury. Unless, therefore, great reduction in expenditures is made during the year 1913 there will be a very large deficit, for I can not believe that the commission will again invade the gold-standard fund, although, I confess, that I am prepared for anything it may do. For the commission has not in the past hesitated to lay its hands upon a, if anything, more sacred fund than this.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman explain the gold-standard fund, because the gentleman sitting in front of me does not understand it.

Mr. JONES. The gold-standard fund, of course, is a fund created for the protection of the silver currency in the islands, the pesos and other fractional silver currency.

The President said in New York that "the Philippines have cost the United States to date only \$3,000,000 for civil expenses, and that this money was appropriated to save them from starvation." Well do I remember that Congress donated this money to save the famishing Filipinos from starvation, but does Presi-

dent Taft know that a considerable part of it was expended on the Benguet automobile road, of which I have spoken? The act of Congress declared that the money should be expended "for the relief of distress in the Philippine Islands." In the estimation of the commission these starving Filipinos stood more in need of an automobile road than of the rice to purchase which the American people in their generosity gave this money.

But at the proper time and in due season those who are responsible for conditions in the Philippines will have graver charges than these to answer. I predict, for instance, that somebody will be required to explain why it was that three prominent American officials of the city of Manila were not removed from office as was recommended by the committee appointed to investigate the grafting charges preferred against them. Some of their subordinates were prosecuted and convicted; but, notwithstanding the findings and recommendations of a committee of investigation, one of whom was Solicitor General Harvey and another Gen. Bandholtz, chief of the constabulary, their superiors have escaped all punishment and two of them are still enjoying the salaries of their lucrative offices. The third has since been removed from office for usury and extortion. The head of this powerful triumvirate, the man who was kept in office by the Governor General, notwithstanding his grafting, and who was removed during the absence of the Governor General last year, was then and is now the Manila correspondent of a great American newspaper. He realizes, of course, that the Filipinos do not love him, and does anybody imagine that his American readers will ever be told through his published letters that the Filipinos are capable of self-government? And it is upon such disinterested and unprejudiced testimony as this that the American people are asked to pronounce the Filipinos incapable of self-government.

But, Mr. Speaker, I shall not pursue this particular subject any further.

I think I have said enough to convince the most doubting Thomas that there is not the least similitude between the Government which we have forcibly set up in the Philippines and those enjoyed by the people of Canada and Australia.

If President Taft really thinks, as he is reported to have said, that we should treat the Philippines just as Great Britain treats Canada and Australia, why, may I ask, has he postponed until the very end of his administration to offer this gratuitous advice to his Democratic successor? Why has he not made some effort during the four years of his administration to give the Filipinos a government in some slight respect modeled after those the like of which he said they should have? It was within his power long ago to have substituted a liberal, progressive, and practically autonomous government, one at least resembling in some respects those of Canada and Australia, for the irresponsible and odious autocracy under which they are now governed.

I shall not now consume much of the time of the House in combating the President's statement that the expense of maintaining troops in the islands is practically nothing.

It will be recalled that in response to a resolution of this House asking for information upon this subject the President sent a message to Congress in July last in which he declared that aside from certain enumerated direct appropriations, the cost accruing to the United States on account of the military and naval operations in and about the archipelago and from the construction of fortifications there could not be determined with any degree of accuracy. The problem presented by the resolution, he said, was "practically insoluble." Now he is moved to say, because of his violent opposition to even a declaration by Congress of any future purpose to grant the Filipinos their independence, that this cost is practically nothing.

To me this is a most incomprehensible, a most amazing statement.

I shall not attempt to inform the House, even approximately, what our military and naval operations in the Philippines have cost the United States from the beginning of American occupation up to the present time. Ten years ago it was variously estimated at from \$200,000,000 to \$600,000,000. On June 19, 1902, former Secretary of War Root, in response to a Senate resolution, informed Congress that our military occupation had cost up to May 1 of that year \$170,326,586.11. He gave no

information as to what had been the cost of our naval operations and none with relation to the Marine Corps, but he did undertake to say with a remarkable "degree of accuracy" what had been the cost of our military occupation. Surely the present Secretary of War could, with an equal degree of accuracy, have informed the President what military occupation at least has cost the United States from May 1, 1902, up to the present time. Secretary Root's figures were based upon the assumption that if the Army had not been in the Philippines an equal number of troops, exclusive of Philippine Scouts, would have been maintained in the United States, which, to my mind, is a very violent assumption. The most casual examination of Mr. Root's report will make it apparent that he excluded from his account many large items of cost which should properly have been included. But, as I have pointed out, he did not assume to say what had been expended by the United States on account of our naval operations and those of the Marine Corps, and I venture the assertion that \$600,000,000, the estimate of the late Senator Hoar, is much nearer correct than the figures furnished by the ex-Secretary of War—what the grand total really is will never be even approximately known. One reason for this is that it is not possible in numberless instances to segregate the items which are properly chargeable to military occupation of the islands from those which are not so chargeable, when these appropriations are made in lump sums for the support of the Army as a whole.

Having made these somewhat general observations, I shall now proceed to give the House some definite information in the way of figures, which if they represent, as they do, only a part of the expenditures being made in the Philippines out of the Treasury of the United States, will at least serve to show that what President Taft may regard as practically nothing is, in the estimation of most people, a very considerable sum.

We have for the past few years kept stationed in the Philippines approximately 12,000 Regular troops and 6,000 native scouts, all of whom are maintained at the cost of the United States. At this time the scouts number 5,660.

It is denied by some of our imperialistic friends that the cost of the maintenance of these 12,000 United States troops in the Philippines should be considered in estimating the expense to us of holding them. They say that the strength of the Regular Army would have been maintained at its present proportions even if the United States had not possessed the islands. I challenge their statement, but even if it were true the expense of our military establishment in the islands would still be far from inconsiderable.

The Army appropriation bill which passed this House on Tuesday last carried an item of \$1,069,470.66 for the pay of the Philippine Scouts for the next fiscal year, and another item of \$500,000 to be expended for permanent quarters and barracks for our troops in the islands. It will not be contended, I think, that these scouts would be needed or ever available were we to withdraw from the Philippines, and in such an event we would not be required to spend half a million dollars a year for the erection of permanent barracks and costly officers' quarters, as we have been doing for years in furtherance of elaborate plans involving an expenditure of millions of dollars. But enlisted men get 20 and officers 10 per cent additional pay when engaged in foreign service, and this Army bill carried a little item of \$995,000, practically every dollar of which is paid to our troops serving in the Philippines, for service in the Canal Zone, in Panama, Hawaii, and Porto Rico is not regarded under the law as foreign service.

I state this to anticipate the objection of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], and the only part of this \$995,000 that is not paid in the Philippine Islands is a very trifling sum paid to a battalion of troops in Alaska.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that perhaps it would be fairer in debate to anticipate something that the gentleman from Kentucky has warranted the gentleman from Virginia in believing he was going to contend.

Mr. JONES. I beg the gentleman's pardon, if I mistook his intention.

Mr. SHERLEY. I trust the gentleman's other conclusions are based on more detailed study.

Mr. JONES. They are based on figures and facts that I do not think the gentleman from Kentucky or anybody else can successfully challenge.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Is it a fact that our Government has to pay a tariff on all of the supplies that are taken to the Philippine Islands from countries other than the United States for the support of the American soldiery in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. I believe that is true.

These three items alone aggregate \$2,574,470.66, a sum which can scarcely be called "practically nothing."

The fortification bill which we are now considering carries for fortifications, searchlights, repair of torpedo-repair structures, mining casemates, and so forth, all to be expended in the Philippines, \$782,350. In addition to this sum it contains appropriations aggregating \$720,000 to be expended in our insular possessions, the bulk of which is to be spent in the Philippines. The naval, general deficiency, and sundry civil bills, yet to be reported, will carry large items for the Philippines, as has always been the case heretofore.

What it costs to feed, clothe, house, and otherwise care for 6,000 scouts in the Philippines I can not say, but the sum far exceeds their actual pay, which I have shown to be \$1,069,470.66 annually. What it costs to provide for the 12,000 Regular troops in the Philippines over and above what it would cost were they kept in continental United States I can not even guess. It is well within bounds to say, however, that the items I have mentioned will exceed in the aggregate \$6,000,000. Is this a mere bagatelle?

The Trans-Pacific Fleet consists of nine Army transports, not all of which, however, are in commission at the same time. The cost of the operation and maintenance of these vessels, which are used in the transportation of troops to and from the Philippines and in transporting animals and supplies for the use of the army of occupation, is enormous. The ordinary repairs for each one of them, for each and every round trip, cost \$2,500, and occasionally they require overhauling, at an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars each.

To give some idea as to what this transport service is costing the United States, I may state that in 1908 repairs to transports and launches amounted to \$606,350.20, whilst the fuel bill for that year was \$632,500. In 1909 these repairs amounted to \$387,212, in 1910 to \$489,921, and in 1911 to \$331,278. The fuel bills were even larger. Just what it costs annually to man and operate these transports I can not say, but for several years the shore expenses of the transport service, such as office and warehouse rental, wharfage charges, employees, and so forth, have averaged around \$1,500,000 annually.

But in addition to the trans-Pacific service there is also an interisland transport service owned, maintained, and operated by the United States. This service costs more than \$500,000 annually. Will it be said that this Army transport service would be necessary were we out of the Philippines?

I have said nothing as to the railroad transportation of troops en route to and from the Philippines, but it is several hundred thousand dollars annually. Nor have I attempted to enumerate the almost numberless other purposes and objects, incident to our occupation, for which we are annually expending large sums of money in the Philippines. Some of these are water and sewer systems, artesian wells, shelter for troops and animals, storehouse rentals, hospitals, clubhouses, military telegraph and telephone lines, a small army of civilian employees, interpreters, guides, and so forth. I have had neither the time nor the opportunity to dig all of these items out of the many different appropriation bills which have carried them, and it is needless to say that the custodians of the accounts in which they are buried have not volunteered me any assistance. The official reports show that for the year 1911 the Quartermaster's Department alone paid out on account of the Philippines more than \$5,000,000, and that the annual expenditures by this department by reason of our military occupation of the islands, leaving out the years when war existed, were more than \$6,000,000.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may understand clearly the purpose of the gentleman in collecting together these figures, may I inquire—and the inquiry is for informa-

78329—11728

tion—if the point he is developing is that they are so expensive that we ought to get rid of them?

Mr. JONES. My primary purpose is to show that the President of the United States, when he said in his speech before the Ohio Society in New York that they cost the United States practically nothing, was greatly mistaken. I also hope to demonstrate incidentally that the Philippine Islands are costing the American people so much that the sooner we free ourselves of them the better it will be for the American people.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Approximately, can the gentleman say what will be the aggregate of these totals which the gentleman has given us?

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will wait, I will come to that in a few moments.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. In relation to the transport service, does the gentleman know the transports run to Honolulu, to Guam, to Alaska, and even down to the Isthmus of Panama?

Mr. JONES. No; I did not know that.

Mr. KAHN. That is a fact.

Mr. JONES. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I know that these Pacific transports do, Mr. Chairman, touch at Honolulu, and they do touch at ports in Japan for the purpose of coaling. I do not know that they always stop at Guam. It is considerably out of the way to touch at Guam. I know of no reason why they should do so regularly. I do know, however, they do not run to Panama. We have an Atlantic Fleet of transports, several of the ships of which are now out of commission at Newport News, in my district. These ships may be sometimes sent to Panama.

Mr. KAHN. An occasional transport goes to Panama—

Mr. JONES. I have never known of one.

Mr. KAHN. And to Guam also.

Mr. JONES. There may have been such instances, but if so, the steamers that are in commission, and which run regularly

between San Francisco and Manila, are not, I think, ever so used. I think the gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, all are taken out of commission from time to time. We have four transports that are used between Manila and San Francisco.

Mr. JONES. I will say to my friend I have very little time and that I must hurry on.

Mr. KAHN. I did not want to interfere with the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. I can not now state from memory what it costs annually to maintain at Washington the large Bureau of Insular Affairs, but I think the amount exceeds \$1,000,000.

Within the last 10 years we have expended in fortifying the entrances to Manila and Subic Bays more than \$11,000,000.

In the figures which I have thus submitted I have charged nothing against the 12,000 Regular troops that are stationed in the islands except their additional pay for foreign service and their transportation to and from the islands; but, in my judgment, it is manifestly proper that their whole pay, as well as the entire cost of their subsistence, should be so charged. If we have no use at home for these troops, then the Army should to that extent be reduced. But we are told by Col. Goethals that 25,000 troops will be required as a permanent garrison at the Panama Canal.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would just like to say that Col. Goethals's testimony, made before the Committee on Naval Affairs and subsequently having that testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, does not warrant the newspaper statement constantly made that he thinks 25,000 men should be put there.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman that I got my information from the newspapers, but I will ask him how many troops does he think ought to be stationed in Panama?

Mr. SHERLEY. He is in accord with the policy of the department that now contemplates something over 8,000 men.

Mr. JONES. If that be true, then——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman to yield me 15 minutes more in which to conclude my remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman pleases, I purposely did not take any time in my own right, so it is not mine to give, but I would be very glad to ask that the gentleman be permitted to continue for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia have permission to continue for 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES. I hope in the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, that no questions will be asked me until I have concluded what I wish to say. It will require all of 15 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, in regard to Col. Goethals, I heard him make the statement before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and he said it would be necessary to have 25,000 troops there, and that is what he asked for and desired.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. If, then, instead of recruiting our Army to that extent, we transfer the 12,000 troops from the Philippines to the canal, we will save at least \$12,000,000 annually, since the exact cost per man for maintaining our military establishment was, last year, \$913.23. Within the past five years it has ranged from that sum to \$1,142 per man, and it costs much more, of course, to maintain troops in the Philippines than in the United States.

When to the cost of the Army of occupation of the Philippines there is added our expenditures on account of the Navy and the Marine Corps, which I shall not undertake to discuss, it will, in my opinion, be found that it is costing the American people to hold the Philippines not less than \$40,000,000 annually. This sum exceeds the total annual value of the commerce between the Philippines and the United States.

We have expended within the past 10 years more than \$1,500,000 in the construction and equipment of the naval station at Olongapo, in addition to some \$1,275,000 on a floating dry dock located at that place. Large sums, too, have been expended at the Cavite naval station, and other large sums for naval hospitals, prisons, magazines, and other objects too numerous to mention.

There may be those who will question my judgment as to the sum total of these expenditures, but I venture to believe that

there will be few who will agree with President Taft that they constitute "practically nothing." The chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, however, has actually gone upon record as saying that "even the additional cost of the support of the troops in the Philippines above the cost of support of the same number in the United States can not properly be regarded as part of the cost of the Philippines." Indeed, he would even deny that the cost of maintaining the Philippine Scouts can be considered a part of the cost of the Philippines to this country. If, therefore, these remarkable ex cathedra statements are to be accepted, the Philippines have certainly cost us nothing. But they are "affirmation pure and simple."

The only comment that I shall make upon the President's alleged statement that were he a politician he could wish the Democrats no worse fortune than the passage of the Jones bill, since its passage would result in a mess and muss which would forever return to plague its makers, is that if the Democratic Party is to be deterred from keeping the solemn pledges it has made to the American people, and upon which it was given control of every branch of the Federal Government, by the political prophecies of one whose administrative policies have been so emphatically discredited and repudiated by the voters of every State of the Union, save only those of Utah and Vermont, its defeat in 1916 will be as deservedly overwhelming as was that of the Republican Party in November last. But whilst I recognize President Taft's great ability and most cheerfully concede the purity of his motives, it must be admitted, I think, by his most ardent political followers that he has not achieved great success as a political prophet.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. If, when I get through, I have a moment left, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it has been made most manifest of late that the administration has been bringing to bear every possible influence, commercial, political, and ecclesiastical, in its efforts to defeat the declared purpose of the Democratic Party to give the Filipinos their independence. The country is being told that the incoming Democratic administration is too ignorant as to

conditions in the Philippines even to attempt a change of the policy which the Republican Party inaugurated and has been pursuing for the past 10 years in respect to them. All those who have any personal and intimate knowledge of the Filipino people and of the real conditions existing in the islands are, we are told, unanimously of the opinion that it would be "suicidal" to recognize the independence of the Philippines.

I readily admit that there is apparently great unanimity of opinion in respect to this subject on the part of the people from whom the administration secures its information, but I absolutely deny that its sources of information are either the most dependable or the only sources.

Many of our naval and military people favor the indefinite retention of the Philippines for purely personal reasons. Naval officers argue, and with reason, that holding the islands will mean the enlargement of the Navy, and any increase in our naval establishment means more rapid promotion for the personnel. Army officers have told me that our withdrawal from the Philippines would mean a reduction of the size of the Army which would be prejudicial to them. Of course, the Americans who have gone to the islands for purposes of exploitation are opposed to their independence.

But the largest and perhaps the most influential class from which the administration derives its information is that of the American officeholders whose names are truly legion. These men are naturally in full accord with the policies of the administration to whom they owe their positions. They wish to continue to hold their jobs, and it is absurd to suppose that they will ever give public utterance to opinions not in accord with those held by the powers that be. Many of them have no sympathy for the poor Filipinos, and some, at least, despise them and take no pains to disguise the fact.

If the American public are to seriously heed testimony derived from sources such as these, we may as well abandon now and forever all hope that the Filipinos are ever to be given their independence, and that the American people are ever to be relieved of the enormous financial burdens which their retention yearly entails.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are not left in that complete ignorance as to conditions in the Philippines which the President assumes to be the case. Not all Americans who have resided in the Philippines and who are thoroughly well-informed as to conditions there, are either exploiters or officeholders, and these have never hesitated to give the true facts, although experiencing difficulty in getting them before the American public. And now that there is to be a change of administration which will remove the restraint which has heretofore been placed upon the officeholders, we may expect to receive some valuable information from that source.

The newspapers are publishing extracts from the last annual report of the Philippine Commission, given out by the War Department, a report which I have not as yet seen, which are, as was to have been expected, fully in line with the statements which have so frequently been given out by the administration and intended, of course, to create in America a sentiment averse to Philippine independence. I do not believe that this last expiring wail of this American-made, law-defying, self-interested oligarchy, which, when legislating for the Filipinos, sits behind closed doors, will accomplish the intended purpose. A governing body which has plunged the Philippines in debt, defeated the administration of justice, and violated, as I have shown, the organic act of Congress, will, when these facts are generally known, become so discredited in the eyes of the people of the United States that it will be a waste of time to make reply to their representations.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave to publish in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a resolution unanimously passed by the Philippine Assembly, praying Congress to investigate the conduct of Dean C. Worcester, a member of the commission; an interview from Judge Charles B. Elliott, of Minnesota, late a member of the Philippine Commission, recently published in a Minneapolis newspaper; a letter received by me from Mr. L. M. Southworth, a prominent member of the Manila bar and for eight years a resident of the Philippines; and a letter written by Mr. William S. Lyon, an American who has been engaged for eleven or more years in farming and other business pursuits in the Philippines. These are not prejudiced or inter-

ested witnesses. Their long and intimate acquaintance with the Filipino people entitles their testimony to great weight.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad, if I have the time left, to answer any question which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] desires to ask me.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question: Can the gentleman state whether it is true or not that the President elect has declared in favor of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. JONES. I will say to my friend that he has doubtless read, just as I have, and other Members of the House, what the President elect said upon that subject in his speech at Staunton. I am not authorized to speak for the President elect, but I will say this to the gentleman: President Elect Wilson is a Democrat; he is a man of honor, and he stands squarely on the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore, and I do not doubt for a moment but that he favors Philippine independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting certain documents to which he has referred. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letters and papers are as follows:

JUDGE ELLIOTT'S INTERVIEW.

Judge Charles B. Elliott, Minneapolis jurist, who announced in Washington a week ago that his resignation as secretary of commerce and labor of the Philippine Islands was at the request of President Taft, and who reached Minneapolis late yesterday, talked freely at the Hampshire Arms last evening of the disagreements with Gov. Gen. W. Cameron Forbes which led to his retirement. Judge Elliott did not feel like discussing the matter when in Washington.

"I am perfectly satisfied," said Judge Elliott, to quit office upon the issues which are involved. Congress is going to investigate official matters in the Philippines, and my protest will be found on record in regard to matters which will be found subjects for severe criticism.

"In a general way conditions in the Philippines are good, and an immense amount of good is being done, but in the administration of details there is much that is outrageous. Two things are a public scandal in the islands now, and will be found when the congressional investigation is made. One is the extravagant and often improper use of public funds by direction of the Governor General and the other is his interference with the administration of justice.

CHARGES DISREGARD OF LAW.

"The only charge against me, if it can be called a charge, was that Mr. Forbes and I did not work harmoniously together. The record
76329—11728

shows that there is no criticism of my official work, and unless it shows that I should not have resigned. Mr. Forbes's complaint was that I was an obstructionist. I confess that I have been. I have protested as far as I was able against what I felt to be illegal acts. I have fought them with some pretty drastic opinions, I admit. I have said, and still say, that it is an infernal outrage to run the government of the Philippines with so little regard for law. We are trying to teach these people how to run a government, and that sort of conduct is setting them a poor example. I opposed Gov. Gen. Forbes continually on those matters; without any personal feeling on my part. I did not know there was any on his until after my resignation had been requested.

"Gov. Gen. Forbes preceded me to the United States on our vacations last spring. He was still in this country when I left recently on my return to the islands. I had no inkling then of any complaint. He did not let me know that there was any issue between us before the President or the department. Evidently he did not care to meet me and discuss the matter before officials at Washington.

TALKED WITH PRESIDENT.

"President Taft visited Mr. Forbes at Boston just a week before I sailed. I saw the President after he had seen Forbes, and he knew nothing then of any complaint. He talked with me about when Forbes would leave and about my departure. Evidently within a few days after I sailed Mr. Forbes came to Washington and told the President that I would have to resign, as we could not get along together. In the circumstances I was wholly unprepared for the cable message I received. That is the only thing I have any personal feeling about. I should have been saved that unnecessary trip to Europe with my family and preparations for return to the Philippines, which cost me about \$2,000."

With regard to his differences with the Governor General, Judge Elliott said that some of them were on trivial matters of administration, and with him never have been personal, but evidently were taken as personal by Mr. Forbes.

ALLEGES WASTE OF MONEY.

"He has been in wretched health, which I think has had much to do with it," said Judge Elliott. "He is personally a fine fellow, but he is impatient of restrictions; not being a lawyer, is impatient of the law; and being a millionaire, he seems to have a contempt for economy. He took the government three years ago with a surplus of \$3,500,000, and at the end of last July had run it into a deficit of nearly \$4,000,000.

"My differences with him began over such matters as this: As secretary of commerce and police I had the distribution of \$1,500,000 a year for roads and bridges. It was to be spent in the discretion of the secretary. Mr. Forbes often wanted to direct the expenditure of some of this fund, and frequently where it was not needed, except to placate a deputy in the legislature from some district. In cases where I did not consider the expenditure was justified I would decline. I offered sometimes to approve an item if he would request it in writing, but that he never would do, and I declined to take the responsibility otherwise.

"Mr. Forbes attempted to get legislation through to concentrate more power in his hands. I opposed such legislation as a member of the senate, and believed I was justified.

QUARREL OVER \$12,000,000.

"Our most important difference, however, arose about a year ago. The legislature refused to pass the regular appropriation bill for the 76329—11728

support of the government. For such a contingency Congress has provided that an amount equal to the appropriation for the previous year shall then be deemed to be appropriated and paid out by the treasurer. Gov. Gen. Forbes took the ground that the sum of \$12,000,000 in gold was thereby placed at his disposal, to spend according to his own judgment. He and his clerks drew up a new appropriation bill and declared it in effect, changing salaries, changing the methods of disposal, and creating 123 new positions, including a secretary to the Governor General, at \$4,500 a year.

"I took a stand against this. I held that legally the old appropriations were merely renewed during the interregnum until a new bill could be passed. I asked that the question be referred to the attorney general of the islands, which was refused. I then asked that it be referred to the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Forbes refused to do either, and proceeded without a legal opinion. The senate referred the matter to a committee of three commissioners, including Señor Areneta, secretary of finance and justice, former attorney general and the leading native lawyer, Commissioner Palma, and myself. We held unanimously that the old appropriations merely held over. Nevertheless, the Governor General continued to dispense the funds at his own discretion, and still is doing so.

"He prepared one bill in December, 1911, dating it in July, when the old appropriations expired. He was advised from Washington to cut out some of his numerous new appointees, so he prepared a new bill in March, and dated it back again to July. As a member of the senate I opposed confirming his secretary, and the senate was against it on legal grounds. In order not to reflect on the young man we asked Mr. Forbes to withdraw the appointment. He did so, but immediately appointed him again, and is still employing him, without confirmation and without warrant in law.

NOT A CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR GENERAL.

"That is the main issue on which we differed, though always, as I supposed, without personal feeling. I have learned since that before leaving for home last March he told friends that he was going to get my removal. I think his feeling against me was increased by the fact that there was gossip of my being a candidate for Governor General. I was never in any sense, and deplored the talk of it that frequently was current in the native papers. I found it also gossip at Washington, but it was wholly untrue.

"To being an obstructionist I plead guilty as to the things I knew to be illegal. My fight against them was supported with some pretty drastic opinions, I admit. I am satisfied with the record as it stands. There will be a congressional investigation of the administration in the Philippines, I was told in Washington, just as soon as the Democrats get in full control next spring. It will be a hostile investigation, and it will bring out some sensational matter. I have done nothing to stir up the investigation, but my protest will be found on file as to all the acts I felt to be illegal or unwarranted. Much public money has been wasted or misspent. The Governor General has interfered often in the administration of justice to favor personal or political friends."

The Filipinos fully expect independence from the coming Democratic administration, Judge Elliott says. "They have every right to expect it," he declared last evening. "The Democrats have promised it in every platform, and if they do not grant it they will break their word. If it is not granted, I fear there will be trouble in the islands."

76320—11728

and united in urging the ingress of American capital. Every dollar of American capital planted in their country cements by a new tie the continuity of present relations. These benighted "savages," so unfit for self-government, have the perspicacity of vision and acumen to grasp this fact and oppose it bitterly.

The newspapers use this as an argument to show that these people have not intelligence enough to grasp the fact that outside capital brings prosperity to a people, ergo, they have not sense enough to govern themselves. The military are no whit behind. They like their tour of duty. They are at less living expense, their travel back and forth is free, and their pay automatically goes up 10 per cent during their detail to the Philippines. In short, we, about all of us, have an ax to grind. Even I am not quite fit to cast the first stone. I have resided here for 11 years because I love the Tropics, and my occupations has given me opportunity to explore this great country from the Batanes to the Sulu Archipelago, and I am sometimes inclined to question if my sense of personal security would be quite as great under a native régime.

At the same time I feel I have no right whatsoever to let my selfish inclinations weigh for an instant against my country's unquestionable duty to give these people the bread (independence) and not the stone ("uplift") with which we attempt to fool them. When I said above, "my personal security," I rather meant to include my countrymen at large, upon whom reprisals might be made for having spoiled the Egyptians. As an individual, I am persona grata to my neighbors, and would feel more secure here at any time than on the streets of Boston.

Having no copyright upon your reserved powers of endurance, I will close.

Very truly,

WM. S. LYON.

P. S.—As an afterthought, and which should have been embodied in my communication, I would call attention to the hollowness and insincerity of any pretense of ours that we mean to ever get out of the Philippine Islands. At this moment the Philippine Assembly is besieged on every side with an attempt to load ourselves upon them in perpetuity with a service pension bill. Not only is every official from the Governor General down lobbying for it, but even the Philippine judges, whose influence is great, are making the same fight. Realizing that their pro-American tendencies would, under native rule, relegate them to private life, they are making hay while the sun shines to get securely landed on the pension roll for life, after a State service of 12 to 15 years. Such being the insolence of Mr. Forbes's and Mr. Worcester's demands. There is enough intelligence in the assembly to realize the nature of this assault upon their pockets. They know that under no circumstances will the United States grant them autonomy except upon their solemn obligation to sacredly observe all their laws affecting citizens of the United States, and they realize the iniquity of being forced to accept this life-everlasting burden.

But forced they are in danger of being. The American commissioners have now an outrageous bill of this nature to hand the assembly. The ultimatum will be, pass it or we will veto your most cherished legislation. Then publish you to the world as obstructionists incapable of self-government. Between the devil and the deep sea, and rather than be branded with so undeserved a stigma, there is a chance that they will be coerced into swallowing this bitter pill. Once give us a life grip upon all the good salaries there are, and we will give these people all the independence they ask for.

L.